

my response to this is: F. GRUMPEER.RSP

Review of Grumman Naval Facility (NWIRP) Remedial Investigation & Alternative Selection

John G. Nevius, P.E., Project Manager
Peer Review Group, Hazardous Waste Facilities Branch (2AWM-HWF)

Carol Stein, Project Manager and Peer Review Group
Hazardous Waste Facilities Branch (2AWM-HWF)

The purpose of this memorandum is to set forth comments regarding proposed soil remedial activity at the Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant (NWIRP) located in Bethpage, NY. I have briefly reviewed the Proposed Remedial Action Plan for Sites 1, 2 & 3 dated October 28, 1995.

Preliminary selection of a remedial alternative(s) is based on information generated during the Remedial Investigation (RI). Detailed information necessary to evaluate whether some of the proposed activity will actually work (e.g., the extent to which on-site soils are amenable to vapor extraction) will be generated during the Remedial Design stage. The following comments should be considered in light of the limited data regarding the efficacy and applicability of some of the proposed technology.

Does the
CNS provide
more
data?

Response:
The TCLP
is more stringent
than other
methods.

The action
levels

What
type of
information
is
being
asked
for?

G.W. will be
monitored
regularly
see reference to this, and
show it to John N.

Decisions regarding the potential extent of metals excavation should not be based on TCLP criteria as is indicated on Figure 11 (see also page 28). More sophisticated modelling regarding metals fate and transport and the potential leaching of residual metals contamination based on soil concentrations levels should be conducted and used to determine appropriate action levels. The TCLP procedure is designed to determine whether something is a hazardous waste and it is not an acceptable means of determining potential leachability in the field!

numbers are a lot more stringent than NYSDEC TAGM values. For this reason, we allowed the Party to use TCLP.

Similarly, additional information regarding the extent to which residual VOC concentrations are "not expected" to leach to groundwater should also be provided. Especially since the proposed remedial alternative would simply treat soils contaminated with VOCs in place using vapor extraction.

Moreover, it is unclear whether sufficient characterization of soils has been conducted in order to determine whether vapor extraction will remove significant volumes of VOCs from soils and/or achieve applicable criteria. Selected removal of VOC

"hot-spots" should be considered as well as other forms of treatment in the event that the proposed method does not achieve remedial goals in a sufficiently expeditious manner. Finally, it is important to coordinate future groundwater remediation and monitoring activity (Operable Unit 2) with vadose zone remediation. The best means of determining whether soil remediation has fully addressed residual migration of contaminants from soil to groundwater is to monitor changes in groundwater quality over time.

Ans: G.W. will be remediated and monitored over time.



Does the ROD recommend airstripping? or GAC? Ans: ROD says the same as the PRAP.
(We would need to make sure that the right air permits, etc. are acquired.)

→ During the design phase it is imperative that VOC emissions be addressed. How will VOCs be captured/treated during vapor extraction and the proposed air-stripping of Bethpage Water District's public water supply well #5 (assuming air-stripping is selected over GAC, see page 19)? p. 14 of ROD for public water supply well; p. 27 of ROD for SVE → ok VOCs from site remed. would be treated.

The practice of "isolating" PCB-contaminated soil by covering it with 8-10 inches of uncontaminated soils may reduce potential exposure and hence risk of contamination (see page 15, section 4.3). [p. 14 of ROD]
However, implementing such does not address the root of the problem and may complicate eventual excavation and clean-up.

Ans: This already has been done at other assessments
cc: C. Stein (2AWM-HWF)
M. Kramer (2AWM-HWF)
B. Tornick (2AWM-HWF)
J. Reidy (2AWM-HWF)

John Barnes
(518) 457-3395

ant to protect workers while at Site 1.
targeted for removal that currently appear at the surface.

Q For John N:
How would it "significantly complicate" eventual excavation, if it's only 8 to 10 inches of topsoil?

